

Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

Darvily M Callier

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,



Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,

Jaye E. Franks



Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely, Lamy. E Ry hes



BUDGET & MANAGEMEN

JUL 5 2007

> T. ELOISE FOSTER Secretary

FCC - MAILROOM

DAVID ROMANS Deputy Secretary

MARTIN O'MALLEY Governor

ANTHONY BROWN Lieutenant Governor

June 20, 2007

The Honorable Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, Room TW-B204 Washington, DC 20554

Dear Secretary Dortch,

In accordance with FCC Public Notice CG Docket No. 03-123, the State of Maryland Department of Budget and Management is submitting the annual consumer complaint log summaries for the 12-month period ending May 31, 2007.

From June 1, 2006, to May 31, 2007, Maryland Relay processed 2,908,557 minutes of service. The State's telecommunications relay service (TRS) provider, AT&T, recorded six complaints for the reporting period (Attachment 1).

While there were no complaints formally filed with the FCC during this reporting period, Maryland Relay continues to work with the FCC to clarify or resolve items as needed. AT&T's contract as the provider of Maryland TRS expired on May 31, 2007, after its fifth and final year. Our new Maryland TRS contract is in place with Hamilton Relay. The new contract term is five years and will expire on May 31, 2012.

For questions or comments, please call me at (410) 767-5891 or frey@dbm.state.md.us.

Sincerely,

Brenda Kelly-Frey, Assistant Director

Telecommunications Access of Maryland

Maryland Department of Budget & Management

cc: Pam Gregory, FCC Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

Mr. Ellis Kitchen, State Chief of Information Technology

Mr. Gregory McKibbin, Deputy State Chief Information Officer

Attachment 1: AT&T Relay Services Maryland 2007 Annual Summary of Consumer Complaints

~Effective Resource Management~

# AT&T RELAY SERVICES MARYLAND

# 2007 ANNUAL SUMMARY OF CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

June 1, 2006 through May 31, 2007

6/10/2007	1_			2006						2007			Ī
MARYLAND	NUL	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	T
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	
	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	
•													


# AT&T RELAY SERVICES

### MARYLAND

# **ANNUAL SUMMARY OF CONSUMER COMPLAINTS**

June 1, 2006 through May 31, 2007 Complaint Summary by Category

6/10/2007				2006						2007			
Category	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	To
rency	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ntiality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	- 0	
sues	0	0	0	0	1	Ö	2	0	0	0	0	0	
eplacement	0	0	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Performance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	1	0	0	Ö	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	



Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:


- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,

Donumer Kenk



Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,

Jodi Smith

So whom it may concern,

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 5 2007

ESG-MAINTERDEM TO A

Our concerns about 4592 Milhoom that

We have been using for about fair yours with Somenson. It charged own lifes when that videos Phone came in we heard that you many Cut Somenson video Phone ...

the se, please don't take UP away
from us. Its our phone and its someon
lacien for us, due to our language and
understanding when using relay pervice.
This like heaving people's phone is their
phone because of their comfort to hear
the other family and princes. Its our
comfort to bee our priends + families.
Our understanding more clearly when discussing
more importants things such as doctors, bills,
et .... Litter than IDD users.

Please Save our Phone (VP) QQ Jour our VP phone & & Jhank you & anald + July Hoore



**Public Utility Commission** 

550 Capitol Street NE, Suite 215 Mailing Address: PO Box 2148

Salem, OR 97308-2148 Consumer Services

1-800-522-2404 Local: 503-378-6600 **Administrative Services** 

503-373-7394

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 0 2 2007

FCC - MAILROOM

445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Room TW-A325 Washington, DC 20554

Federal Communications Commission

RE: In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CG Docket No. 03-123

Dear Ms. Dortch,

June 22, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch Office of the Secretary

The State of Oregon has enclosed materials to address the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandate that an annual log of all consumer complaints that allege a violation of the federal minimum standards for Telecommunications Relay Services be filed with the FCC.

 Enclosed is the annual Complaint Log which includes complaints received between June 1, 2006 and May 31, 2007 with the date of complaint, the nature of the complaint, the date of its resolution and an explanation of the resolution.

An additional copy has been mailed to:

Pam Gregory
Federal Communications Commission
Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room 3-C417
Washington, DC 20554.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 503-373-1400 or via e-mail at <a href="mailto:jon.cray@state.or.us">jon.cray@state.or.us</a>.

Respectfully,

Jon Cray, RSPF Program Manager

CC: Pam Gregory, FCC

Lee Beyer, PUC Commission Chairman

Ray Baum, PUC Commissioner John Savage, PUC Commissioner

Rick Willis, PUC Executive Director

David Poston, PUC Central Services Division Administrator

Damara Paris, Sprint Nextel Relay Program Manager



Sprint Nextel 700 SW Taylor, STE 300 Portland, OR 97205 800-750-5894 Voice

800-750-5894 Voice 503-937-2409 TTY 913-523-9873 FAX

June 13, 2007

**Damara Paris** 

Relay Program Manager Email: damara.g.paris@sprint.com

Mr. Jonathan Cray, RSPF Manager Oregon Public Utility Commission Telecommunication Assitance Programs 550 Capitol Street NE, STE 215 Salem, OR 97301-2551

Re: In the Matter of Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, CG Docket No. 03-123

Dear Mr. Cray,

Sprint has provided you the following information to support your filing with the FCC for the State of Oregon:

 An annual Complaint Log which includes complaints received between June 1, 2006 and May 31, 2007 with the date of complaint, the nature of the complaint, the date of its resolution, and an explanation of the resolution.

As mandated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), Sprint has maintained a log of all consumer complaints that allege a violation of the federal minimum standards for Telecommunications Relay Services and is providing you with a summary to file with the FCC. You must reference to the **CG Docket 03-123** in the subject line, as done above.

In its Public Notice, the FCC requests information concerning the total number of interstate relay calls by type. This information is not currently required by the Rules, and the FCC cannot impose additional reporting requirements absent a rulemaking and absent approval from the Office of Management and Budget. In fact, the staff has informed Sprint that the provision of call volume data will be voluntary. Thus, you are not required to provide the number of relay calls with your reports and your submission will be considered to be in compliance with the Rules without such information.

Sprint has decided to provide information to the FCC concerning the number of calls. However, Sprint will do so under seal since call volume information is proprietary and confidential. Sprint believes that the more relevant number for comparison with the total number of complaints is the total number of outbound calls.

Please note that for your state you must send (1) an original and four copies of the printed report and (2) an electronic copy of the complaint log on a CD (formatted in an IBM compatible format using Word 97 or compatible software) on or before Monday, July 2, 2007. These items should be sent to the Commission's Secretary (via US Postal Service, First Class Mail, Express Mail or Priority Mail):

Marlene H. Dortch, Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> St., SW, Rm TW-B204 Washington, DC 20554

# Complaint Tracking for OR (06/01/2006-05/31/2007). Total Customer Contacts: 64

08/22/06 Apologized to customer. Follow up requested. Coached agent on call procedures and followed up with customer on 8/22/06.	TTY customer stated the agent hung up on her.	08/21/06
08/11/06 Apologized to customer. Follow up requested via TTY. Coached agent on call procedures. Followed up with customer on 8/11/06.	TTY customer stated that she gave the agent her calling card 800 number and PIN to get the balance of her calling card minutes. She stated the agent did nothing, and then hung up on her.	Ö8/11/06
08/21/06 Apologized to customer. Follow up requested. This agent is no longer employed with the relay service. Followed up with customer and explained that this agent is no longer employed, therefore, further investigation is impossible. Customer was satisfied with response.	08/08/06 TTY customer stated that during a business call, the operator made a mistake and hung up. Customer stated this operator needed additional training.	08/08/06
07/31/06 Apologized to customer. Follow up requested. Forwarded complaint to TL with instructions to coach the CA on proper procedures when dialing a wrong number such as immediate credit. Followed up with customer via letter.	TTY customer complained that agent dialed the wrong number. Apologized to customer. Follow up requested.	07/31/06
07/31/06 Apologized to customer; follow up requested. Discussed the complaint with and coached operator on procedures, and followed up with customer.		07/31/06
08/24/06 Apologized to customer; follow up requested.	TTY customer called to state that s/he seemed to be disconnected by the agent while talking with his/her mother on the phone.	07/28/06
07/08/06 Apologized to customer. Follow up was requested via mail.  Forwarded complaint on to agent's supervisor. TL spoke with the agent about disconnecting the call. Agent does not remember the call, but states that he followed procedure when disconnecting all calls. Sent a letter to customer to follow up.	On 07/06/06, TTY customer told agent to dial number, and the agent typed bye SKSK. Customer repeated the request, but the agent appeared to hang up.	07/08/06
06/28/06 Apologized for the inconvenience and stated this would be forwarded to the appropriate supervisor. Supervisor stated this agent had called her over to the station stating her headpiece fell on the keyboard which caused her to lose the call, prior to the complaint coming in. A follow up letter has been sent explaining problem. Supervisor stated that the agent was able to explain the problem to the outbound party.	TTY customer stated that the CA connected her and typed an explanation of how the person answered the phone, then there were beeps on the line that told her that the CA hung up.	06/28/06
06/26/06 Spoke with the CA, who stated that he is seeing a lot more calls that drop or disconnect with no apparent reason. Reminded the CA that if he has calls that abruptly disconnect during the call or at the start of the call, to inform a supervisor to check for possible technical problems. CA said he understands why he should contact supervisor when this happens.	TTY customer called stating that agent hung up and did not dial as requested.	06/23/06
06/28/06 Apologized to customer; no follow up requested. Team Leader (TL) met with the agent, who does not remember the call. TL coached the agent on proper call procedures.	TTY Customer stated that on 6/17/06, s/he placed a call and agent hung up after the third outbound ring.	06/19/06
Date of Explanation of Resolution Resolution		Date of Complaint

	Nature of Complaint	Date of	Explanation of Resolution
t		Resolution	- COME TO A CONTROL OF THE CONTROL O
	OR voice customer could not get through to the number she is calling because of her number being blocked. The person she is calling will not accept her call.	08/21/06	Reviewed the database and found that there is permission to send the number to the called party. Apologized to the customer and turned in a trouble ticket. Customer wanted follow up by the account manager. Trouble ticket was closed after the problem had been resolved. Left a voice mail letting customer know that the issue had been resolved and to contact if there are additional problems.
4/06	Voice caller stated his wife is having a great deal of garbling on her VCO Ameriphone. Agent attempted to rule out easy fixes for the garbling problem. Caller would like a voice-to-voice call back to troubleshoot the problem extensively. If the problem cannot be fixed the caller would like information on how to proceed.	10/18/06	Attempted to reach customer on 10-02-06, 10-04-06, 10-18-06.  Complaint is closed due to inability to reach the customer.
	OR TTY user complained that agent did not follow instructions and hung up on the outbound answering machine recording during a call on 9/6/2006.		Apologized; no follow up requested. Supervisor met with agent, who stated customer requested a hang up after answering machine message was already finished. Agent does know the importance of following customers instructions.
ļ	OR TTY user complained that agent typed entire answering machine recording instead of hanging up on the recording as requested.	09/14/06	Apologized; no follow up requested. Supervisor coached agent to follow customer instructions. Agent understood.
	TTY customer stated that agent did not follow his instructions to not type out the outbound answering machine message. The instructions were that if the agent reached an answering machine, to just hang up, but the relay agent typed the entire message.	09/15/06	Apologized; no follow up requested. Supervisor coached agent to follow customer instructions. Agent understood.
9/06	TTY caller stated that while trying to access information about a 800 calling card number, the agent was rude, kept interrupting the customer, and didn't type out the recording.		Agent was coached by TL on the proper procedures for following customer instructions and keeping the customer informed, not interrupting customer, and being friendlier. Customer did not request a follow up.
	TTY Caller stated that agent did not follow instructions to hang up if an answering machine was reached on the call. Agent instead typed ans. mach. message.		Apologized to customer. Discussed with agent the procedures for following customer instructions. Agent understood. No follow-up was requested.
	OR TTY caller called to complain that agent disconnected without placing the call.	10/13/06	Apologized; no follow up requested
	When TTY user called relay, the first three numbers were typed to the agent when the call was disconnected.		Apologized and reassured customer that agent would be coached.  Agent was coached on appropriate call procedures.
	TTY Customer said she had four agents during the duration of her call.		Apologized to customer FCC requires that an agent be on a call for at least 10 minutes before it is taken over. FCC requirements were met. No follow up requested.
	TTY caller believes agent hung up on him/her. Customer called the same outbound number four times in a row and then asked the agent to continue dialing. After ringing for a while, the call was disconnected.		Apologized. Supervisor met with the agent, who did not remember this call and would never hang up on a customer. Agent demonstrated knowledge of the importance of not disconnecting calls and is aware of the consequences of doing so. No follow up requested.

03/13/07	03/13/07	03/13/07	03/12/07	03/11/07	03/08/07	Complaint 03/06/07
VCO customer unable to make outgoing calls via OR Relay. Stated people could not hear her voice, but had no problem with incoming calls.	CapTel user complained about the accuracy of captions	Voice customer placing call to VCO user reported that the agent typed without spaces, was inaccurate, and misspelled words; Caller commented that both parties were not getting the full conversation; voice customer also stated that the agent did not ask for a slower pace when questioned if there was a problem, and responded with a negative tone. When inaccurate typing continued, both customers asked agent if they could have another agent and were then placed on hold.	03/12/07 TTY caller said agent was very rude to him and his son.	Voice customer called in to customer service and it came in on the TTY line. The system did not detect ASCII so it automatically switched to the voice line. RCS answered the call and the person shared the problems experienced with the Oregon Relay Center. He stated that every time he calls 711 with his cell phone, he gets the Oregon Relay Center but he gets put on the TTY line and the system switches him to the voice line; the operators do not give the greeting for a voice user - they just hang up. He has spoken to supervisors about this and they did not help him. He stated that the operators and the supervisors he has spoken with are rude.	OR VCO customer called to complain that when she placed a phone call and wanted to leave a message, the agent did not let her know if the message had been left. Caller stated that the phone call was placed around 7:45pm PST.	TTY customer stated that he called Oregon Relay a couple of days ago and the operator told him that he remembered customer from a previous call and that he could not place prank calls. Customer he did not know what operator was referring to and asked to speak to supervisor; when supervisor by the name of Abe came on the line, he too told customer that he could not be placing prank calls. Customer stated that he uses relay to call Deaf friends and knows what he is doing in regards to the use of Relay.
04/10/07	03/13/07	03/13/07	03/12/07	03/11/07	03/08/07	Resolution 03/06/07
Apologized for inconvenience; customer requested follow up ASAP. Contacted customer at 3:30 pm with no response. Contacted customer again on 3/30/ 07 at 9:00 am, 4/2/07 at 11:12 am and 4/10/07 at 5:30 pm. Complaint closed due to lack of customer response.		Apologized and informed the customer that concerns will be forwarded to center handling call. Met with agent, who did remember a VCO call in which the VCO was complaining of bad typing. Agent said typing was clear on her screen and VCO must have been getting garbling. This was witnessed by another supervisor. Voice customer then informed agent that she was going to hang up and redial. Agent appeared to have followed procedures.	03/12/07 Agent was coached on appropriate communication protocols.	Attempted to provide the person with 800 number for the voice users for the Oregon Relay Center but he did not want it. Informed customer that the complaint would be logged, and asked if he wanted to have a follow up; he declined. No agent ID provided. Unable to research without this information.	03/08/07 Apologized for the inconvenience. Agent has been coached on proper calling procedures. No follow up was requested.	Apologized to customer and informed him that someone would be in contact with him per his request. Relay Program Manager for Oregon contacted customer by e-mail at 10:40 AM Specified in the e-mail to the customer that due to the lack of necessary information to track the call (no agent ID) or dates/times, we were unable to take further action. Advised the customer to note agent ID and dates and times of calls in the future so that we can assist him with his concerns. Closed due to lack of information.

ıt	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
	OR VCO user had trouble connecting, and agents could not hear him. Issue occurs frequently, with no specific times or dates given.	Resolution is pending and will be resolved within the required 180 days.	Customer would not give information to establish a trouble ticket, saying the agents already have that. Apologized and explained that technicians are aware of issue and working to correct it. Provided VCO #, and suggested also to have his 30-year-old TTY device checked. Customer requested follow up. Contacted customer, but the call was cut off in the middle of the conversation. After 30 minutes of redialing and receiving a busy signal, discontinued calling. Called customer again and informed him that this issue will be escalated to a technician.
9/07	OR VCO customer called to complain that for the past month no one she's calling has been able to hear her. The last incident was 3/18/07 at five or six p.m.	Resolution is pending and will be resolved within the required 180 days.	Apologized; follow up requestsed. Trouble ticket states that the platform for VCO has a voice degradation bug and a release to fix the bug has been scheduled for release. Contacted customer to report the resolution on four occasions3/22/07 at 4 pm, 3/30/07 at 9:30 am,4/27/07 at 2 pm, and 5/15/07 at 11:25 am. Unable to reach customer.
	TTY caller complained that agent said one moment please, and then hung up on both inbound and outbound callers.	-22	Thanked caller for the feedback and apologized for inconvenience.S upervisor followed up on this incident with agent and coached on proper call procedures. Customer did not request a follow up.
	TTY Customer stated that agent dialed the call out and the phone rang, and then the agent disconnected the call, which was very urgent.	03/23/07	Apologized to customer for the inconvenience. Unable to coach the agent without and agent ID number. No follow up requested.
	OR VCO user very displeased with service. Customer unable to make an International call to directory assistance.	03/28/07	Apologized and explained International long distance is required for any caller who makes International relay calls, and that DA calls within U.S. is provided as courtesy through relay. Referred customer to her long distance provider. Customer refused to leave a follow up contact, therefore this complaint has been closed.
9/07	OR VCO customer complained that when he dials out through relay, he is not getting information about whether the call is local or long distance. The last call was approximately 12:15 p.m. on 3/29/07.	04/27/07	Apologized for inconvenience. Opened trouble ticket. Follow-up requested. Followed up with Customer in person to discuss this issue. Trouble ticket could not reproduce the problem and advised the customer that more information is needed regarding the number calling from, dialed to in order to research the problem. Customer agreed to provide this information if this occurs again.
	outbound parties when he calls via relay. He has to call back to be heard. The last time this happened was 4/5 at 9 a.m. PDT.	pending and will be	Apologized for inconvenience. Opened a trouble ticket. Follow-up requested. Met with customer on 4/27/07 to explain that the system was being worked on and a resolution is scheduled to be released in the summer.

efore 01/05/07/Non-agent error. Letter was sent to customer per follow up request cents. get TRS	01/15/07 CapTel user called to complain about a general technical issue that occurred during a CapTel call	01/15
		01/0
12/26/06 Apologized and opened a trouble ticket. Follow up requested. Contacted customer through relay on 12/29/2006. Was unable to communicate effectively with the HCO user on the phone. Resumed communication by e-mail on 12/29/2006. Account manager asked for clarification because it appeared the TTY was malfunctioning and causing the problems with long distane calls through the relay. Continued communication on 1/2/07 and 1/12/07 with suggestions to contact the PUC for replacement equipment. Complaint closed due to satisfactory follow up.		12/2
to make 12/22/06 Apologized and assured this would be forwarded to appropriate supervisor. Discussed proper procedures with operator. Account manager to follow up as requested.	12/05/06 TTY Customer stated she gave the phone number to agent to make a call, but agent typed sksk and then hung up on her.	12/0
but 01/18/07 Apologized; customer requested follow up. ID number does not correspond to any agent currently working. Called customer and left message regarding this information. Customer did not respond back.	12/01/06 TTY Customer said agent was not relaying what was typed but relaying what she thought was said, and putting her words in place of his. Customer said agent was making up stories and repeating wrong things. When the customer asked if agent was relaying the conversation properly, the agent replied I'm on the clock until ten. Customer threatened legal action.	12/0
r to dial.  12/06/06 Agent was coached by TL on the proper procedure for handling prepaid calling cards. Also coached on improperly disconnecting at the CA callers and the ramifications involved. TL wrote a letter on 12/06/06 with contact results.	11/30/06 TTY Customer gave a calling card number, PIN and number to dial. Agent did not respond and did not dial. Customer clock said 8:35 when she sent info. At 8:37 her TTY beeped and showed that the CA hung up. Customer would like the CA's supervisor to find out what happened and send her a follow up letter.	11/3
11/01/06		11/0
n Failure. 10/25/06 Unit's account activated. Unit now operational and customer is able to use his phone.	10/25/06 CapTel customer called to complain about an Account Login Failure.	10/2
	10/24/06 OR TTY customer complained that the agent disconnected him after he made a call. He had paused to write down an extension number for his own records, and when he came back, the operator was gone. Apologized for inconvenience. No follow-up requeested.	10/2
Date of Explanation of Resolution Resolution	of Nature of Complaint	Date of Complaint

	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
1/07	TTY Caller stated that agent disconnected call when calling Customer Service. Wanted to enter a formal complaint.	01/21/07	Apologized and said the complaint would be forwarded to the agent's supervisor. Would like a call back via TTY. Complaint was about supervisor hanging up; supervisor tried 3 times to talk to customer and was hung up on. Customer Service called customer to explain this and and before they were finished identifying themselves, customer hung up. Complaint closed due to inability to communicate with customer.
3/07	TTY Customer reports CA was unresponsive on 1/23/07. He did not keep customer informed during the call.	01/23/07	Apologized; follow up requested. This agent was terminated on 1/23/07 for similar quality of service complaints witnessed by a supervisor. Communicated this to customer.
2/07	TTY caller stated that agent was rude and did not tell customer how many minutes were remaining on the customer's calling card during the call.	02/02/07	Apologized to customer. Agent was coached on the importance of relaying all information including minutes left on calling cards, agent understood Customer did not leave contact information to follow up on resolution.
7/07	VCO Customer could not be heard when connected to party.	02/15/07	Apologized for the problem and opened up a trouble ticket. Follow up necessary for problem resolution. There was not enough information to resolve this issue. Without the date and time, there was no ability to research the log files to see what might have occurred during the call. Called customer on three occasions to gather more information, but customer did not answer. This issue closed due to lack of customer response.
/07	TTY caller contacted RCS because the agent did not tell the customer how many minutes were left on her phone card. The customer asked several times but did not get a response on the minutes on her card.	1	Forwarded on to correct center for followup. Agent has been coached on the importance of typing remaining number of minutes on calling card. Agent understood. Customer did not give contact information to follow up on resolution.
/07	CapTel user called to report that s/he was unable to dial regional 800 number		Technical Support made adjustment so CapTel user can successfully make captioned call to regional 800 number.
/07	CapTel network issue was identified by CapTel user.	03/05/07	Technical problem identified. Resolution provided by network vendor.
/07	CapTel network issue was identified by CapTel user.	03/05/07	Technical problem identified. Resolution provided by network vendor.
/07	CapTel customer complained regarding about the accuracy of captions.	03/05/07	Customer shared feedback regarding captioning speed. Apologized for the incidence and thanked customer for the feedback; assured that information would be shared with appropriate captioning service staff. Suggested customer document the date, time, and CA number for more specific follow up.
/07	CapTel network issue was identified by CapTel user.	03/06/07	Technical problem identified. Resolution provided by network vendor.

	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
<i>/</i> 07	TTY Customer stated that agent did not follow database instructions to turn off Turbo Code.	04/23/07	Apologized for the inconvenience and assured customer that this would be forwarded to an appropriate supervisor. No follow up requested. Agent remembered this call and had a supervisor assist with disabling Turbo Code. The correct procedures were followed and Turbo Code was disabled but customer kept insisting that it was not.
/07	TTY customer stated she gave number to dial, waited for dialing, and the agent hung up on her. The call happened around 11:30am (Oregon time).	04/12/07	Met with CA, who did not remember the call. CA stated they did not hang up on the call. CA felt that perhaps the call had dropped as they had one call that disconnected after dial out. Did not remember if it was Oregon. TL followed up with the customer per request.
/07	Voice caller stated that Agent made inappropriate sexual comments	04/18/07	TL met with agent and discussed the importance of following customer instructions. Went over proper call procedures and discussed the consequences of deviating from those procedures. Agent understood.
/07	OR VCO customer called to complain that people are still unable to hear him through the relay, both inbound and outbound.	Resolution is pending and will be resolved within the required 180 days.	A Trouble Ticket was turned in previously on this issue on April 5 but no resolution was received. This last occurred 4/19/07 approximately 9:25 a.m. Apologized for the inconvenience and opened another trouble ticket. Follow-up requested. Met with customer on 4/27/07 to explain that the system was being worked on and a resolution is scheduled to be released early summer.
/07	CapTel customer called to complain about echo sounds on the CapTel.	04/23/07	Advised customer to make use of volume settings to optimize sound quality on CapTel phone. Advised customer how to properly hold handset for echo reduction.
707	OR VCO customer had volume issues through relay service.	Resolution is pending and will be resolved within the required 180 days.	Apologized and turned in a Trouble Ticket; a previous Trouble Ticket was turned in on 4/19/07. Also gave customer the RPM phone number. No follow up needed. RPM met with the customer on 4/27/07 to discuss concerns; customer continues to struggle with the VCO issue. Customer has also recently made arrangements to receive a CapTel phone and will try using CapTel instead of VCO to see if this works for him. RPM agreed to follow up in one month.
(07	OR VCO customer stated on numerous occasions he has attempted to place calls through relay and the outbound individual cannot hear him. The most recent was on 4/25/07 at approximately 1 PM Customer placed call to equipment program using relay and the equipment program staffer was unable to hear his voice.	Resolution is pending and will be resolved within the required 180 days.	Apologized to customer and turned in a Trouble Ticket Follow up requested by a Technician and the Account Manager. Also gave customer the RPM phone number. No follow up needed. RPM met with the customer on 4/27/07 to discuss concerns; customer continues to struggle with the VCO issue. Customer has also recently made arrangements to receive a CapTel phone and will try using CapTel instead of VCO to see if this works for him. RPM agreed to follow up in one month.

06/02/07 Apologized for the problem and opened Trouble Ticket Sent an e- imail to customer on 6/1/07 to gather more information. Comcast is not on the approved Carrier of Choice list. RPM will proceed with the necessary paperwork to get the Carrier of Choice established. Customer stated that she was pleased with the proposed solution.	06/02/07	05/31/07 TTY customer cannot make long distance calls using Comcast as long distance.	05/31/6
06/07/07 This complaint was recorded at 3:38 pm on 5/25/07. Reopened and forwarded to customer service for further information. Closed contact after three unsuccessful attempts.	06/07/07	05/25/07 TTY Customer was frustrated about being unable to connect to a Spanish operator. As soon as s/he is told s/he will be transferred, the call disconnects. This was the 8th attempt.	05/25/0
05/02/07 Apologized to customer. Trouble Ticket was closed after test calls were made. The macro appears to be working. Customer did not give contact information, and did not request a follow up.	05/02/07	05/02/07 OR VCO customer stated the macro that states if the call is local or long distance is not received.	05/02/0
Explanation of Resolution	Date of Resolution	Nature of Complaint	Date of Complaint

HEUEIVED & INSPECTED

JUL 5 2007

FCC - MAILROOM

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123

Federal Communications Commission (FCC)
445 Twelfth Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Martin, Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a leaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is intent on drastically cutting the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS and the local Deaf communities
- Provide service and technology improvements, such as the development of new videophone equipment, fulfilling the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandate of functionally equivalent telecommunications services

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,

Lilyan Andewson 158 5th avenue Beighne, my 11706 May 07

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

FCC - MAILPOOM

# RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin,

Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am a deaf person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is **proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate**, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,

Signature

Hugh E. Gounn Jr.

Address
City

Talladega

State Alabama
Zip 35161

Email HJGowan 83@hotmail.com

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin,

Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am the properson and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

The Man Road of the State of th

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Signature

Printed Name
Address
City
State
Zip
Email

Signature

AUL PATZ

A

Sincerely.

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin.

Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin,
Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am appearson and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,	
Signature	Com M Farland
Printed Name Address City State Zip Email	DONNA ME Farland  331 W. EASTON ST.  RIALto CA.  92376

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin,

Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am the properson and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications services.

Sincerely,	ine all
Signature	David E Hy
Printed Name Address	DAVID E. HUFF 370 W. EASTON ST
City	RIALTO
State	ĆA
Zip ·	9.2376
Email	

Federal Communications Commission (FCC) 445 Twelfth Street SW Washington, DC 20554

RE: CG Docket No. 03-123; TRS Fund—Drastic VRS Rate Cuts

Dear Chairman Martin,

Commissioners Adelstein, Copps, McDowell, and Tate:

I am about person and I use Video Relay Service (VRS) to communicate. I was appalled to learn that the FCC staff is <u>proposing a drastic cut to the VRS rate</u>, and effectively cutting VRS availability for the deaf. Instead of seeking to limit the number of deaf people with VRS access, the FCC should do everything in its power to make VRS available to more deaf people.

I, along with other Deaf individuals, use these services in both my work and personal life. It is an important way in which I/we communicate with both hearing and deaf individuals. I urge you to do everything you can to make VRS service available to the many deaf people who currently do not have access to this vital, life-changing service.

The VRS rate should encourage the VRS providers to:

- Serve more deaf people, not discourage them from reaching out to more deaf people
- Provide interpreter training programs so that there will be an adequate number of qualified interpreters for VRS
- Improve service and technology so the mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for functionally equivalent telecommunications services is met

I, along with other deaf individuals, their families and coworkers, depend on VRS and other relay services.

Please stop any VRS program cuts and fulfill the mandate of the ADA to provide deaf people with functionally equivalent telecommunications, services.

	/
Printed Name         CHRISTOPHER N. HOFF           Address         370 W EASTON ST.           City         RIALTO           State         CA           Zip         92376           Email	